

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 RICHARD DENSON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 DET. JOHN LUCAS, , *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-525-APG-VCF

**Order Affirming Magistrate Judge's Order**

14  
15 On February 21, 2013, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach entered his Order (Dkt. No. 82)  
16 addressing Plaintiff's Motion to Request Stay/Permit Law Clerk to Appear At Deposition (Dkt.  
17 No. 72) and Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. No. 73). Judge Ferenbach denied those  
18 motions, and further ordered "that, if plaintiff believes that his criminal counsel possesses video  
19 surveillance, plaintiff may complete the authorization form . . . provided by defendants and return  
20 it and plaintiff's criminal counsel's name and contact information to defendants on or before  
21 March 15, 2013. If defendants are able to obtain any video surveillance of the incident,  
22 defendants must produce the video to plaintiff within one week from receipt of the video." (Dkt.  
23 No. 82 at p. 11.)

24 On March 4, 2013, Plaintiff filed an Objection to Judge Ferenbach's Order (Dkt. No. 83),  
25 to which Defendants filed an Opposition (Dkt. No. 85).

26 Local Rule IB 3-1(a) states that a "district judge may reconsider any pretrial matter  
27 referred to a magistrate judge in a civil or criminal case pursuant to LR IB 1-3, where it has been  
28

1 shown that the magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law." This court has  
2 reviewed Judge Ferenbach's Order, the underlying motions and papers, the Plaintiff's Objection  
3 and Defendants' Opposition. Judge Ferenbach's Order is not clearly erroneous or contrary to  
4 law. Accordingly,

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's Order (Dkt. No. 82) is  
6 affirmed.

7  
8 DATED THIS 12th day of July, 2013.



---

ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE